

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20, 22 – 32 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20 and 22 – 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Deleeuw, U.S. Patent No. 5,828,900 (“Deleeuw”). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 in response to this rejection. For instance, claim 1 now requires “receiving from the application a request to disclose said code, wherein said request is generated by the application incident to the application recognizing that said sentinel value represents a type of input event that is capable of being processed by said application.” Similar claim language is also now found in amended independent claims 13, 25 and 30. In light of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that Deleeuw fails to teach or suggest each and every aspect of the amended independent claims.

Deleeuw addresses preventing an application from handling input events and teaches the disablement of the application. Deleeuw, col. 2, ll. 1 – 34; col. 6, ll. 9 - 12. In handling an input event, Deleeuw expressly requires the disablement of an application to prevent event handling. Deleeuw, col. 2, ll. 1 – 34; col. 6, ll. 9 - 12. As the Office Action explains, “[T]he purpose of Deleeuw’s invention is to prevent the application from processing and displaying such erroneous results for ultimate use by the application. Although the application would accept the input the user would not be able to understand such results, thus the disablement of the application.” Office Action, p. 8 (emphasis in the original)(internal citations omitted).

Deleeuw, however, does not teach “receiving from the application a request to disclose said code, wherein said request is generated by the application incident to the application recognizing that said sentinel value represents a type of input event that is capable of being processed by said application,” as required by claim 1. Indeed, nowhere does Deleeuw suggest an application processing a dummy variable to determine whether it represents a type of input capable of being processed by the application. Nor does Deleeuw teach revealing the obfuscated input code to the application in response to an explicit request to disclose said code. Though Deleeuw discloses an “application that would accept all and any input”, *see* Office Action at 8, the independent claims now make clear that the application must recognize “that said sentinel value represents a type of input event that is capable of being processed by said application.” As such, the application does not accept “all and any input” and avoids the erroneous results contemplated by Deleeuw. *See* Deleeuw col. 2, ll. 5-15. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2 - 6 and 8 - 12, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 14 - 20 and 22 - 24, which depend from claim 13, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 26 - 29, which depend from claim 25, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 25. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 31 and 32, which depend from claim 30, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 30.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 6, 8 – 20, 22 – 32 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547